

Potential Alternative Options for Boys Leadership Academies

Option	Things you would have to believe	Pros	Cons	Open questions
<p><i>Current recommendation:</i> Consolidate two programs into a single location in an existing modernized building on the east side</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new location (plus transportation support) can be found that attracts at least some portion of both BLA student populations and new students in order to achieve enrollment viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses two schools significantly below enrollment viability (requiring \$715k in budget assistance for 2018-19) by consolidating into 1 program Vacates two older buildings and repurposes an under-utilized existing modernized building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk of any location not attracting enough families to reach viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the risk that even with consolidation and a modernized building, there will not be enough students to reach enrollment viability for the BLA? What existing new facility locations will serve as a draw for families from further away, even with transportation?
<p><i>Alternative option 1:</i> Close both buildings and programs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite significant investment, there is not sufficient demand for BLA to achieve viability, regardless of location and transportation support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closes two of the smallest K-8 schools in the district and allows for reinvesting \$715K in budget assistance towards viable schools Reassigns students into more modern buildings while reducing the potential capital costs of maintaining older buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates gender academy imbalance due to viability of two GLA options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the next best alternative to continued investment in these school models? (On a per student basis, is continued or increased investment warranted in light of alternatives?)

Potential Alternative Options for Boys Leadership Academies

Option	Things you would have to believe	Pros	Cons	Open questions
<i>Alternative option 2:</i> Build enough space at new MacArthur to accommodate a single, consolidated BLA to be co-located with MacArthur GLA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A consolidated program in a new, west-side facility will give BLA the greatest opportunity towards reaching viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Captures operating cost benefits of a consolidated BLA Relocates students into a new facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would expand the scope of the MacArthur project with roughly \$7M in added cost Unknown impact on the integrity of the gender model with a BLA / GLA co-location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What resources are available to fund the expansion of a new, shared campus to include Valley View? If the boys academy were to close due to continued low enrollment, would capacity be adequate to support a second viable program on the site, given the GLA model?
<i>Alternative option 3:</i> Move Clement into an existing, modernized east side building while maintaining Valley View in their existing campus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new, existing east side location can be found that attracts a large portion of Clement students and new students in order to achieve enrollment viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocates east side students into a newer facility Closes older building Operates BLA on each side of the city 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unlikely that either program will approach viability given two locations, which necessitates on-going budget assistance Valley View students remain in an older facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the long term plan for Valley View given that it remains in an older facility with very low enrollment? What enrollment growth is needed to continue investing in Kenneth Clement?
<i>Alternative option 4:</i> Maintain both programs in existing locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The value of maintaining an all boys model for both east and west side families is greater than the alternative uses of resources required to do so (subsidizing two schools significantly below enrollment viability; maintaining two older facilities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operates BLA on each side of the city Continues to invest in BLA as a program model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unlikely that either program will approach viability given two locations, which necessitates on-going budget assistance Students remain in an older facilities, which run the risk of capital investment needs to address facility challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What level of viability is CMSD going to continue to fund across two locations if enrollment does not increase?

Potential Alternative Options for Tremont Montessori

Option	Things you would have to believe	Pros	Cons	Open questions
<p>Current recommendation: Relocate program to an existing modernized building on the east side with investments in the school model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suitable east side location will allow for many families to continue attending while meeting viability in a modernized facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deploys an existing, under-utilized modern facility to serve a viable city-wide draw program Prioritizes capital funds on schools with higher neighborhood population dynamics Scranton, Marin, Buhrer remain as nearby options to serve Tremont residents not interested in Montessori 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks losing west side enrollment depending on the specific location selected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which east side location will continue to allow a specific model to draw a high percentage of families from across the city?
<p>Alternative option 1: Consider options to embed Montessori “pathways” on east and west sides (e.g., PreK-3rd grade school-within-a-school model)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offering two lower-grades programs captures the majority of interest in Montessori while reducing the need for a full relocation or capital investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects popularity of lower-grades Montessori Allows for families to attend Montessori on each side of the city in newer facilities Reduces capital investment needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential budget needs of supporting two lower-grade programs Potential challenges of matriculation of students from two models within a school to upper grades Tremont would no longer have a school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are budget assistance needs for two locations instead of one? What newer west side campuses are able to support this model as opposed to leaving it in Tremont in an older facility?
<p>Alternative option 2: Invest in Montessori model while remaining in the existing Tremont facility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program investments will improve performance and rebound enrollment while utilizing the current central location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invests in the Montessori model to improve performance in a popular program Maintains city-wide location and presence for Tremont residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students remain in an older facility with maintenance risks Accredited Montessori likely requires supplemental funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What level of additional model funding will be made available in support of a Montessori? What academic quality must be delivered to continue those investments?

Potential Alternative Options for Tremont Montessori

Option	Things you would have to believe	Pros	Cons	Open questions
<p><i>Alternative option 3:</i> Build new facility (in Tremont or similarly central location) to house Montessori model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Montessori program maintains popularity and improves performance to prioritize construction above other needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invests in a viable school with popularity If located on the west side, constructs a facility that could be re-purposed to serve K-8 needs with another program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given funding constraints, likely requires another project to be de-prioritized in addition to operating fund needs Opportunity cost of funding a city-wide program that could utilize existing newer facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other resources are used to build this building? What level of additional model funding will be made available in support of a Montessori? What academic quality must be delivered to continue those investments?
<p><i>Alternative option 4:</i> Build new facility (in Tremont or similarly central location) to house non-Montessori model (could serve as replacement school for Scranton and/or Marin)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centralized location supports capital investment for a program to serve nearby families, though with a traditional program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fact Base supports investing in Near West / West regions due to forecast Allows for capacity to serve a greater percentage of students living nearby versus current Montessori 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given funding constraints, likely requires another project to be de-prioritized in addition to operating needs Investments are already slated for Clark, Gallagher, and Marion Seltzer serving area students Discontinues investment in Montessori, which has proven popular 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other resources are used to build this building?
<p><i>Alternative option 5:</i> Maintain program in existing location</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership changes will rebound enrollment and improve performance without additional model investments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserves both operating and capital funds for other priority projects Maintains a facility and Montessori program in Tremont 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the track record, the school is unlikely to dramatically improve performance without significant investments Students remain in an older facility that carries maintenance risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What school actions does CMSD take if performance does not dramatically improve in future years? What level of capital investment in maintenance does CMSD spend given newer alternative locations?

How do the student population dynamics compare between neighborhoods of potential capital investment?

	Brooklyn Centre (Denison)	Cudell-Edgewater (Marion-Seltzer)	Detroit Shoreway (Gallagher)	Fairfax (Bolton)	Kamm's (MacArthur)	Stockyards (Clark)	Tremont (Tremont)
# of 2017 Births¹	159	208	158	70	336	138	100
Change in Births (2012-2017)¹	-3%	+9%	-11%	-20%	+15%	-15%	+2%
Birth to Kinder Cohort Ratio²	105%	93%	74%	79%	82%	99%	59%
2017-18 K-8 Population: CMSD and Overall³	823 / 1,347	950 / 1,630	699 / 1,106	328 / 636	982 / 2,206	972 / 1,513	298 / 506
Change in CMSD K-8 Population (2012-2017)³	+7%	-3%	-17%	-5%	-8%	0%	-30%

Summary Insights

The emerging recommendations include new construction investments for Clark, Denison-Mooney, Marion-Seltzer, MacArthur, and a renovation for Gallagher, while seeking an existing newer K-8 facility for Tremont due to the city-wide draw and transportation as well as for a consolidated Dike/Bolton program at Margaret Ireland. The underlying student population dynamics for the prioritized projects support capacity investments for those neighborhoods compared with Fairfax and Tremont due to the number of births and far greater K-8 population size and trend.

1: Ohio Department of Health Vital Statistics

2: Ohio Department of Health Vital Statistics; Geo-coded CMSD, charter, and private school student-level data based on April 30 count

3: Geo-coded CMSD student-level data based on April 30 count

Select a Location

Selected Tremont neighborhood

Level

all

Location

Tremont

[Change Location](#)

[or look up neighborhood using address](#)

Population Metrics

It is important to monitor changes in population in a neighborhood, understanding where neighborhoods are growing or losing population, and understanding changes in neighborhood demographic make-up.

Now viewing data for Tremont

Note: clicking the [Map](#) button will allow for a cross-location (city-wide) comparison of a given indicator. The cross-location information is available in a table as well.

[Download as PDF](#) | [Download as CSV](#)

Population by age	% change	2008- 2012	2013- 2017
Persons aged under 5	54.2%	361 +/-	556 +/-

[i](#) [Map](#)

CV: 21.7
MOE (+/-): 128.5

CV: 16.7
MOE (+/-): 152.7

What is the MOE (margin of error)?

Indicators that use the American Community Survey (ACS) as a data source are estimates based on a survey of a sample of the population. Because they are estimates, they are reported with a margin of error (MOE) calculated at the 90 percent confidence interval. This means that the real value of the indicator is within a range; one can be 90 percent confident that the true value is the estimated value, plus or minus the MOE.

What is CV (coefficient of variance)?

Indicators that use the American Community Survey (ACS) as a data source are estimates based on a survey of a sample of the population. Because they are estimates, they are reported with a margin of error (MOE) calculated at the 90 percent confidence interval. In working with indicators calculated from the ACS in years past, we have learned that people generally have a difficult time determining the quality of the estimate at smaller geographies. We're providing the coefficient of variance, a measure of the reliability of the estimate, to aid in interpreting the reliability of the estimate. The Census provides the following guidelines for determining the reliability of the estimate:

Coefficient of Variance <15% - Good

Coefficient of Variance >15% and < 61% - Fair

Coefficient of Variance >= 61% - Poor

Potential Alternative Options for Dike and Bolton

Option	Things you would have to believe	Pros	Cons	Open questions
Current recommendation: Consolidate two programs into the Margaret Ireland building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Margaret Ireland building can be repurposed in order to accommodate a vibrant focus on the arts Those district-wide students currently commuting to Dike will commute to the new building The loss of current/potential consolidated student population is minimal The value of vacating two older buildings and repurposing an unused existing modernized building outweighs the disruption of the status quo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows 600+ students access to modernized building Provides students commuting to Dike for the arts program a more centralized east side location Allows district to more easily resource a vibrant arts program Allows district opportunity to take two older buildings offline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes the only CMSD K-8 from the Fairfax neighborhood Potential to draw existing students away from other CMSD K-8 schools in Hough putting increased pressure on their enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the residual impact of this relocation on schools in the Hough neighborhood, which also has student population risks based on their data? What level of improvements would need to be made at the existing facility to prepare it to house a vibrant arts program?
Alternative option 1: Construct a new K-8 campus (450-675 seats) near Karamu House for a combined program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development efforts in Fairfax help to stabilize or increase enrollment enough to justify new construction in that area Those district-wide students currently commuting to Dike will commute to the new building The loss of current/potential consolidated student population is minimal The value of vacating two older buildings and building a new building outweighs the disruption of the status quo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows 600+ students access to new building Allows district to more easily resource a vibrant arts program, especially in potential partnership with Karamu House Allows district opportunity to take two older buildings offline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forces the district to trade off new construction elsewhere Presents longer timeline due to new construction lead time Adds an additional K-8 building to the CMSD portfolio on the east side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does this project compare to Benesch and Marion Sterling, given the Central neighborhood's population density and walkability to those schools?
Alternative option 2: Maintain both programs in existing locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development efforts in Fairfax help to stabilize or increase enrollment enough to justify maintaining Bolton The value of maintaining the status quo outweighs vacating two older buildings and repurposing an unused existing modernized building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains one CMSD K-8 in the Fairfax neighborhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevents 600+ students from accessing a modernized building Prohibits both programs from obtaining add'l resources afforded by larger combined enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given current viability, academic quality, and enrollment trends, how long will the schools be given an opportunity to turn around their key metrics?